(7) No written record has been made by the Diwan about the details of the inspection. The question was one of general impression and the Diwan was satisfied of the proper execution of the works.

Concession to salt contractor Mr. Arunachalam Chettiyar.

134. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state the date, the purport and the orders of the Government on each of the petitions submitted by Mr. Arunachalam Chettiyar, the late salt contractor, during the last five years for the grant of some concession or other referred to in the answer to question No. 204 of the budget session of 1101?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—

Date	Purport	Order
1. 21— 7—1098 and 2. 7— 2—1099	Requesting compensation for losses sustained by him in 1097 and 1098.	A sum of Rs. 26,933-12-0 was allowed towards a portion of the losses in 1098. The matter has not however been finally disposed of and it has been ordered that any further compensation for losses in 1098 would be considered on the production of satisfactory evidence of loss by the contractor.
3. 30— 1—1100	Representing that his losses have not been fully compensated for and requesting to extend to him the patronage shown to other contractors and to pay him the amounts due on account of difference between the cost price and selling price and to repay the amounts with held from him previously.	The petitioner was told that on the information then furnished by him, the Diwan would not be justified in modifying or relaxing the terms of the petitioner's legal contract.
4. 31— 2—1100	Submitting the audit report and the balance sheet of his business up to the end of 1098 and requesting a reconsideration of the orders passed.	The petitioner was asked to submit his profit and loss statements for the several years during which he had been a contractor.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

	Date	Purport	Order
5.	2— 5—1100	Requesting to pass such orders as would compensate his losses to a reasonable extent	The petitioner was informed that he must submit his profit and loss accounts for the several years during which he had been a contractor
6.	1— 5—1100	Same as above and also requesting to give him an extension of contract for a period of another six years	
7.	10— 9—1100	Requesting to compensate him for losses incurred in 1098, 1099 and 1100	Orders have not been passed
8.	29—12—1100	Telegram reminding the above	
9.	5— 6—1101	Reminder to the above	
10.	32—12—1100	Two petitions — one requesting increased rate for the additional 25,000 maunds of salt ordered to be supplied in 1100 and the other complaining against the classification of the consignments of salt by the Superintendent	The two requests were disallowed
11.	22— 2—1101	Requesting a personal hearing before final orders are passed on the above two petitions	Prayer granted

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—May I know what was the nature of the loss referred to in the first and second petitions?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—I will refer to the petition and say.

President.—What is the question put?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—May I know what was the nature of the loss referred to in the petition?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—The loss was due to the fact that the price of salt had abnormally risen in Bombay and on account of the rise in the freight of the salt from Bombay to the market. If he were to supply salt at the contract

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

rate he would incur heavy losses and also the freight charges have already increased, and it is on this ground that some special concession was shown.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Is it a condition of the contract that such losses will be made good?

President.—No such condition.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Why was this concession given then?

President.—The matter was strictly one of right.

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—The Government used to show some consideration if a contractor had to incur heavy losses due to causes beyond his control.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Were there not variations in prices in previous years and in subsequent years also?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—In some cases there had been variations.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The next petition is 3. Was any concession given to any other contractor like this? In the purport it is mentioned that other contractors had been given some such patronage.

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—I do not remember. I have no knowledge.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Was this profit and loss account referred to in the order on the 5th petition submitted subsequently?

Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.—I want notice.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Why is it that the 7th petition dated 10th Medam 1100, is kept pending for such a long time? Orders have not yet been passed.

President.—They are petitions which require long considerations.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Was any interview allowed to take place subsequent to that prayer referred to in that petition? The petition was for personal interview and in pursuance of that order when did the interview take place?

President.—I cannot say.

Tenders for the supply of salt.

135. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the names of the persons who submitted tenders for the supply of salt in pursuance of the Gazette notification made in 1102;

(b) what are the rates of each of them;

(c) to whom was the contract given; why was he preferred?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly